## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 17-00533 EMC
Plaintiff, v. ) Juny Nelson )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT  DEC - 4 2017
Defendant. )	SUSANY SOONG
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from 12 14 17, to 12 13 by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this	and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be like See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosecu or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ade	tion, or the existence of novel questions of fact quate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial his section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due dilig	he defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, ence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	conably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unreas necessary for effective preparation, taking in See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	conably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: 12   17	Ship N Groth
$\mathcal{A}_{\Lambda}$	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney